UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,139	03/15/2004	Paul Haefner	GUID.609PA	9243

51294 7590 08/10/2010

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK
8500 Normandale Lake Blvd
SUITE 320
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55437

EXAMINER	
KAHELIN, MICHAEL WILLIAM	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3762	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/10/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/801,139	HAEFNER, PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL KAHELIN	3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *25,35 and 49-65* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *25,35 and 49-65* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20040315*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Based on Applicant's amendment of claim 35 in the response of 6/21/2010, the restriction requirement of 5/20/2010 has been withdrawn. Claims 25, 35, and 49-65 are pending and treated on their merits below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In regards to claims 49-53, it is unclear which element or elements of the system claims the language limits. The examiner is considering the controller to carry out the functions (*e.g.*, "the controller indicates the heart rate to be normal" in claim 49, line 4), but the claims should be clarified. In regards to claim 53, it is unclear whether the (unrecited) element of the system is required to perform a "correlating" function. The claim recites "discrimination...based on temporal correlation," but has not set forth anything that performs this correlation function. In regards to claim 54, the controller is recited as opening a correlation window "based on" a cardiac cycle fiducial point, but the claims have set nothing forth to determine fiducial points. The examiner is considering the controller to perform these functions, but the claims should be clarified.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 25, 35, 49, 51, 52, 57, 59, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moberg et al. (US 5,496,361, hereinafter “Moberg”).

7. In regards to claims 25 and 35, Moberg discloses a patient-implantable device (Fig. 18) comprising a housing (244); a plurality of electrodes for sensing electrical activity and features (250); electrical detection circuitry (252); an accelerometer for sensing heart movements (246); cardiac acceleration sensing circuitry (248); a controller (254) configured to correlate and discriminate between normal cardiac function and arrhythmia based on the electrical and acceleration signals (col. 18, line 49 to col. 19, line 17); communications circuitry (258) to telemeter the electrical and

acceleration signals (col. 19, lines 12-17); and a patient external device comprising circuitry to receive the signals (col. 19, lines 12-17). Although Moberg discloses determining arrhythmia by manipulation of the electrical and acceleration signals over time and programmability of the controller (col. 18, lines 49-67); and that the two signals are sent to the external telemetry unit (col. 19, lines 12-16), Moberg does not expressly and explicitly disclose that the implantable and external units have a memory for saving the two signals, that the external device has a user interface for providing a visual output of the two signals, or that the acceleration is an "audio" signal. However, it is notorious in the art to provide both implantable and external units with a memory for saving various signals to provide the predictable results of computing with ubiquitous programmable microcontrollers and allowing monitoring of patient condition over time; external telemetry devices with user interfaces for providing a visual output various signals to provide the predictable results of allowing a clinician to monitor patient condition; and monitoring heart accelerations as an "audio" signal to provide the predictable results of gathering frequencies of acceleration known to be useful in diagnosing various conditions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Moberg's invention by providing both implantable and external units with a memory for saving various signals to provide the predictable results of computing with ubiquitous microcontrollers and allowing monitoring of patient condition over time; external telemetry devices with user interfaces for providing a visual output various signals to provide the predictable results of allowing a clinician to monitor patient condition; and monitoring heart

accelerations as an “audio” signal to provide the predictable results of gathering frequencies of acceleration known to be useful in diagnosing various conditions.

8. In regards to claims 49, 51, 52, 59, 61, and 52, Moberg discloses diagnosing arrhythmia based on heart rate (col. 18, lines 33-34), with the acceleration signal used to confirm the diagnosis (col. 18, line 60 to col. 19, line 1). Since a high electrical-indicated rate is not confirmed as arrhythmia without acceleration signal confirmation, the system/method necessarily indicates the electrical-indicated rate as subject to "noise" (*i.e.*, not reflective of the “true” physiological rate).

9. In regards to claim 57, the sensor is on a lead (Figs. 19 and 20).

10. Claims 50, 53-55, 60, and 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moberg in view of Mai et al. (US 6,643,548, hereinafter “Mai”). Moberg discloses the essential features of the claimed invention including diagnosing arrhythmia based on heart rate (col. 18, lines 33-34), with the acceleration signal used to confirm the diagnosis (col. 18, line 60 to col. 19, line 1), but does not expressly disclose diagnosing arrhythmia based on morphology of the electrical signal, correlating the S1 sounds with the QRS complexes, opening a correlation window for cardiac cycle fiducial points and identifying heart sounds within each window, or detecting heart sounds based on a human input. However, Mai teaches diagnosing arrhythmia based on morphology of the electrical signal (col. 5, line 24) to provide the predictable results of more reliable detection of heart conditions, correlating the S1 sounds with the QRS complexes (Fig. 4) and opening a correlation window for cardiac cycle fiducial points

and identifying heart sounds within each window (Fig. 4 and col. 2, lines 35-48) to provide the predictable results of accurately determining patient condition for modification of treatment, and detecting heart sounds based on a human input (col. 9, lines 17-25) to provide the predictable results of consistent data acquisition. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Moberg's invention by diagnosing arrhythmia based on morphology of the electrical signal to provide the predictable results of more reliable detection of heart conditions, correlating the S1 sounds with the QRS complexes and opening a correlation window for cardiac cycle fiducial points and identifying heart sounds within each window to provide the predictable results of accurately determining patient condition for modification of treatment, and detecting heart sounds based on a human input to provide the predictable results of consistent data acquisition.

11. Claims 56, 58, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moberg in view of Lee (US 7,035,684, hereinafter "Lee"). Moberg discloses the essential features of the claimed invention except for transmitting the indication of arrhythmia to the external device or a sensor, electrodes, and housing that form a rigid unitary structure. However, Lee teaches that is it known in the art to provide indications of arrhythmia to external devices (col. 12, lines 62 to col. 13, line 3) to provide the predictable result of sending information that is most useful to the clinician; and a sensor, electrodes, and housing that form a rigid unitary structure (Fig. 3) to provide the predictable results of an easily implantable system. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Moberg's invention by providing indications of arrhythmia to external devices to provide the predictable result of sending information that is most useful to the clinician; and a sensor, electrodes, and housing that form a rigid unitary structure to provide the predictable results of an easily implantable system.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25 and 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, necessitated by amendment.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lee is one of many teachings of internal and external memories, external displays, and recording "audio" signals.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL KAHELIN whose telephone number is (571)272-8688. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Niketa Patel can be reached on (571) 272-4156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Kahelin/
Examiner, Art Unit 3762